	Case 1:23-cv-01733-GSA Document	9 Filed 08/06/24 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOSEPH VINCENT KAUTH,	No. 1:23-cv-01733 GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR THE FUNDING OF PHONE CARDS
13	v.	
14	TULARE COUNTY SHERIFF	(ECF No. 6)
15	DEPARTMENT, et al.,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR COURT RESPONSE AS MOOT
16	Defendants.	(ECF No. 8)
17		
18	Plaintiff, a county jail inmate proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has filed this civil	
19	rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States	
20	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	Before this Court are Plaintiff's motion for funding and a request for a court response.	
22	ECF Nos. 6, 8. For the reasons stated below, the motions will be denied.	
23	I. REQUEST FOR FUNDING OF PHONE CARDS	
24	Plaintiff has filed a motion which requests that be granted \$40.00 a week for the purchase	
25	of phone cards. ECF No. 6. In support of the request, Plaintiff states that he is indigent and	
26	needs to hire investigators, make contact with defense witnesses, etc. <u>Id.</u> at 1.	
27	Plaintiff is informed that a grant of in forma pauperis status to a litigant does not entitle a	
28	Plaintiff to such funds. See generally 8 U.S.C. § 1915(f)(1); Porter v. Dep't of Treasury, 564 F.3d	
		1

	Case 1:23-cv-01733-GSA Document 9 Filed 08/06/24 Page 2 of 2	
1	176 n.3 (3rd Cir. 2009) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(f)(1)). For this reason, Plaintiff's request will be	
2	denied.	
3	II. <u>DEMAND FOR COURT RESPONSE</u>	
4	Plaintiff has also filed a document which is titled "Demand for Court Response". ECF	
5	No. 8. Plaintiff motion requests that the Court review his case so that it may proceed to the next	
6	step. Plaintiff is informed that the Court has now completed the screening of your complaint an	
7	in it has given you instructions on how to next proceed. For this reason, Plaintiff's demand for	
8	Court response is deemed resolved.	
9	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
10	1. Plaintiff's request for funding of phone cards (ECF No. 6) is DENIED, and	
11	2. Plaintiff's request for court response (ECF No. 8) is deemed RESOLVED.	
12		
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	Dated: August 5, 2024 /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
16	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	n	